arXiv:cond-mat/9608054v2 14 Aug 1996

Boltzmann and Statistical Mechanics †

E. G. D. Cohen
The Rockefeller University
New York, NY 10021, USA

"O! immodest mortal! Your destiny is the joy of watching the evershifting battle!"

Ludwig Boltzmann

† Lecture given at the International Meeting "Boltzmann's Legacy - 150 Years after his Birth", organized by the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 25 - 28 May 1994, in Rome, to be published in: "Atti dell"Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei", 1997.

1 Introduction

I received two invitations to this meeting: in the first unofficial one I was asked to speak "on the transport properties of dense gases". This involves the generalization of the Boltzmann equation to higher densities, a topic on which I have worked for more than 35 years. Later, I also received an official invitation, in which I was asked to give a lecture of "a generalized character". Although the first topic would be a natural and relatively easy one, since I have spoken on it often and thought about it a lot, the second one seemed much more difficult but irresistibly challenging, in allowing me to view Boltzmann's work in the last century from the perspective of the end of this century. This seems at first sight to be a precarious undertaking for a research scientist, but, as I hope to make clear to you, there may be advantages to this. While the historian of science is able to place the work of a scientist of the past in the context of that of his contemporaries the research scientist can place the work of that scientist in the context of present day research and, up to a point, identify with his difficulties and achievements in the past on the basis of his own experience in the present day. I embark then on my perilous self-imposed task in the hope of providing some new perspectives on Boltzmann and his work, which are, I hope, historically not too inaccurate as far as the past is concerned, and stimulating, if not provocative, as far as the future is concerned.

2 Boltzmann, mechanics and statistics.

At the time Boltzmann, born in 1844, began his career, Mechanics was the queen of theoretical physics, by far the most completely developed part of theoretical physics, the example as well as the ultimate goal for all other branches of theoretical physics.

In the second half of the 19th century two major obstacles were to present themselves to this: the Second Law of Thermodynamics and Electromagnetism. Boltzmann's first attempt to "mechanize" the Second Law can be found already in his second paper, published at age 22 in 1866, entitled "On the Mechanical Meaning of the Second Law of the Theory of Heat"[1]. It is good to keep in mind that the Second Law consists of two parts; 1. a reversible and 2. an irreversible one. 1. introduces the existence of an integrating factor, the inverse absolute temperature 1/T, for the heat dQ reversibly supplied to or removed from a system, such that $dQ/T = dS$, the (total) differential of the entropy S; 2. states that the entropy of an isolated (adiabatic) system can never decrease. In section IV of Boltzmann's 1866 paper: "Proof of the Second Law of the Mechanical Theory of Heat" he mainly addresses the first aspect and is very cavalier about the second, the more difficult or, perhaps better, intractable one. He first deals with the case that heat is supplied to a system under the condition of equality of the inner and outer pressure of the system, and he shows that in that case $\oint dQ/T = \oint dS = 0$. He then argues that if this equality of pressures does not obtain, dQ must be smaller, so that in that case $\oint dQ/T < 0$. This is clearly at best a physical argument not a mechanical proof!

Two years later in a paper called: "Studies on the Equilibrium of the Kinetic Energy Between Moving Material Points"[2], he follows Maxwell in introducing probability concepts into his mechanical considerations and discusses a generalization of Maxwell's distribution function for point particles in free space to the very general case that "a number of material points move under the influence of forces for which a potential function exists. One has to find the probability that each one of them moves through a given volume with a given velocity and velocity direction". This is the first of many papers in which Boltzmann discusses and generalizes Maxwell's

velocity distribution for point particles in free space to the case that external forces are present[2,3] and to (polyatomic) molecules[4], leading to the Boltzmann factor and the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function[5].

Yet in 1872, when Boltzmann derived in his paper: "Further Studies on Thermal Equilibrium Between Gas Molecules" what we now call the Boltzmann equation for the single particle position and velocity distribution function in a dilute gas[6] and used, following Clausius and Maxwell, what the Ehrenfests called the Stoszzahl Ansatz, he does not seem to have fully realized the statistical nature of this assumption and therefore also of the ensuing H-theorem, for the approach to equilibrium. He says[7]: "One has therefore rigorously proved that, whatever the distribution of the kinetic energy at the initial time might have been, it will, after a very long time, always necessarily approach that found by Maxwell".

The beauty of the H-theorem was that it derived in one swoop both aspects of the Second Law: first the (irreversible) approach to thermal equilibrium and then, from the value of the H-function *in* equilibrium, the connection between the H-function and Clausius' entropy S: H = –const. S + const. Only later forced by Loschmidt's Reversibility Paradox[8] and Zermelo's Recurrence Paradox[9], as the Ehrenfests were to call them[10], did Boltzmann clearly state the probabilistic nature of the Stoszzahl Ansatz, viz. that the Stoszzahl Ansatz and the H-theorem only held for disordered states of the gas and that these states were much more probable than the ordered ones, since the number of the first far exceeded that of the second.

In the paper itself, however, this is never mentioned; it is as if the Ansatz was self evident. Therefore, Boltzmann did *not* derive here the Second Law purely from mechanics alone either and till the present day, no mechanical derivation of the Boltzmann equation exists, although the Stoszzahl Ansatz must ultimately be deriv-

able from the mechanics of a very large number N of particles, i.e., from "large N-dynamics".

I must admit that I find it difficult to assess Boltzmann's precise attitude towards the mixture of mechanics and statistics that a description of the behavior of macroscopic systems – gases mainly for him – necessitates. Uhlenbeck, a student of Ehrenfest's, who was himself a student of Boltzmann's, told me several times: "Boltzmann was sometimes confusing in his writings on the statistical aspects of his work and this, in part, prompted the Ehrenfests to write their clarifying and in a way definitive article to answer his opponents[10]".

The depth of ill-feelings generated by Boltzmann's exhausting discussions with his German colleagues, especially the Energeticists[11] and the resistance to his ideas, in particular with regards to the H-theorem that surrounded him, still resonated for me when Uhlenbeck said to me one day in some mixture of anger and indignation: "that damned Zermelo, a student of Planck's, nota bene"[12], an echo after two generations of past injustice and pain inflicted on Boltzmann by his hostile environment. Let me quote Boltzmann himself in his introduction to his response to Zermelo in 1896, for another aspect of his isolation and near desperation. After having explained that he has repeatedly and as clearly as possible emphasized in his publications that the Maxwell distribution function as well as the Second Law are of a statistical nature, he says[9a]: "Although the treatise by Mr. Zermelo "On a Dynamical Theorem and the Mechanical Theory of Heat" admittedly shows that my above mentioned papers have still not been understood, nevertheless I have to be pleased with his article as being the first proof that these papers have been noticed in Germany at all".

I want to cite a second indication of this solitude. Boltzmann wrote a letter to H. A. Lorentz in 1891, in response to a letter Lorentz sent to him, which pointed out for

the second time an error in one of his papers[13]: "Already from the postmark and the handwriting I knew that the letter came from you and it pleased me. Of course, each letter from you implies that I have made an error; but I learn then always so much, that I would almost wish to make still more errors to receive even more letters from you". This quotation must be seen in the above mentioned context of Boltzmann's isolation in the German speaking countries, since in an earlier letter to Lorentz in 1886, in response to the above mentioned earlier error he made, he says[14]: "I am very pleased that I have found in you someone who works on the extension of my ideas about the theory of gases. In Germany, there is almost no one who understands this properly".

Probably motivated by the opposition of his contemporaries to his mechanical or kinetic method to prove the Second Law on the basis of the Boltzmann equation via the H-theorem, Boltzmann switched completely in 1877, when he introduced his statistical method, as the Ehrenfests called it, with no mechanical component in it at all, leading to the famous relation between entropy and probability. In this 1877 paper: "On the Relation Between the Second Law of Thermodynamics and Probability Theory with Respect to the Laws of Thermal Equilibrium[15]" he begins by saying[16]: "A relation between the Second Law and probability theory showed, as I proved[4b], that an analytical proof of it is possible on no other basis than one taken from probability theory".

Boltzmann emphasizes this necessity of probability concepts to understand the Second Law throughout the 1890's, when he mainly argued with his opponents over the interpretation of the H-theorem: his creative period had lasted about twenty years and one could ask to what extent this had been influenced by his difficulties with his contemporaries. To be sure, Boltzmann's explanations of the crucial points

concerning the interplay between mechanics and probability which were at the heart of Loschmidt's and Zermelo's objections to the H-theorem, although basically correct, did not capture all the subtleties of the necessary arguments and together with the hostile Zeitgeist made his efforts largely unsuccessful, certainly for himself. One must admit, though, that even today it is not easy to explain the paradoxes clearly, even to a sympathetic audience!

In particular, in his rebuttal of Zermelo's Recurrence Paradox[9] in 1896 and 1897 Boltzmann argued as clearly as he could, from a great variety of points of view, just as he had done twenty years earlier against Loschmidt's Reversibility Paradox[8]. It seems like a last vigorous attempt to show once and for all that there was really no conflict between mechanics and his kinetic theory. It was to no avail and this must have greatly depressed him. When Einstein in 1905 proved the existence of atoms by Brownian motion[17], it was far too late: Einstein was still unknown in 1905 and Boltzmann had probably given up long before then. I do not know whether Boltzmann ever read or heard of Einstein's paper, but if he did, although other causes undoubtedly played a role, it might – considering the state he must have been in – have contributed to, rather than prevented, his suicide in 1906. A systematic, critical and very structured account of Boltzmann's arguments was finally presented in 1909 - 1911 by the Ehrenfests' "Apologia" in their above mentioned Encyclopedia article[10].

It is ironic perhaps to note that Boltzmann's second approach, the statistical method, introducing what we now call Boltzmann statistics, has been in retrospect much more influential than the first, the kinetic method. This is in part because it has turned out that a meaningful generalization of Boltzmann's equation to higher densities, as well as obtaining concrete results from such an equation, have proved very difficult. Nevertheless, many new deeper insights into the behavior of dense

nonequilibrium fluids have resulted from this work[18]. Boltzmann himself clearly preferred the kinetic method over the statistical method, because it was based on the dynamics, i.e., the collisions between the molecules out of which the gas consists and therefore allowed a direct connection with the motion of the particles. That statistics also came in was finally due to the presence of very many particles, but no substitute for the basic mechanical nature of the behavior of gases. As if he had a premonition of this future development, Boltzmann's summarizing "Lectures on Gas Theory"[19] are almost exclusively devoted to the kinetic method and hardly mention the statistical method at all.

Boltzmann never lost his predilection for mechanics. In his 1891-1893 lectures on Maxwell's theory of electromagnetism[20a], he used, wherever he could, elaborate mechanical analogies, by endowing the ether with all kinds of intricate mechanical properties. This had been started by Maxwell himself in 1856[21] but later Maxwell abandoned this approach in his presentations. Boltzmann was very well aware of his "old-fashioned" mechanical predilection. I quote what he said, in a lecture "On Recent Developments of the Methods of Theoretical Physics", at a Naturforschung meeting in Munich in 1899[22]. After having described the situation in theoretical physics as it existed at the beginning of his studies when[23] "the task of physics seemed to reduce itself, for the entire future, to determining the force between any two atoms and then integrating the equations that follow from all these interactions for the relevant initial conditions," he continues: "How everything has changed since then! Indeed, when I look back at all these developments and revolutions, I see myself as an old man in scientific experience. Yes, I could say, I am the only one left of those who still embrace the old wholeheartedly, at least I am the only one who still fights for it as much as he can ... I present myself therefore to you as a reactionary, a straggler,

who adores the old, classical rather than the newer things...".

Although it was Boltzmann himself who introduced the idea of an ensemble of systems (he called it "Inbegriff" or "collection"), this (probabilistic) "trick", as he later called it, did not deter him from a deep mechanical point of view as well. The ensemble is first mentioned in the beginning of a paper in 1871 entitled[4b] "Some General Theorems on Thermal Equilibrium": "One has a very large number of systems of material points (similar to a gas which consists of very many molecules, each of which itself is again a system of material points). Let the state of any one of these point systems at any time t be determined by n variables $s_1 ... s_n$; ..... we have only to assume that between the material points of the various point systems no interaction ever occurs. What one calls in the theory of gases the collisions of the molecules, will be excluded in the present investigation.....The number of variables s that determines the state as well as the differential equations [of motion] should be the same for all systems. The initial values of the variables s and consequently the states at an arbitrary time t on the other hand should be different for the various point systems"[24]. It was a neat trick to compute the macroscopic observables of a gas as an average over many samples of the gas, each with different initial coordinates and momenta of the gas particles, assuming tacitly equal a priori probability of all the possible microstates of the gas with the same total energy. It was much easier than following the motion of all the particles in a given system in time and then taking a time average. Boltzmann used it to determine the equilibrium distribution function for a gas in thermal equilibrium. Curiously enough, Maxwell used the same idea independently in an 1879 paper entitled[25]: "On Boltzmann's Theorem on the Average Distribution of Energy in a System of Material Points". He says[26]: "I have found it convenient, instead of considering one system of material particles, to consider a

large number of systems similar to each other in all respects, except in the initial circumstances of the motion, which are supposed to vary from system to system, the total energy being the same in all. In the statistical investigation of the motion, we confine our attention to the *number* of those systems which at a given time are in a phase such that the variables which define it lie within given limits". Maxwell does not mention Boltzmann here because he probably stopped reading Boltzmann after 1868, due to the - for him - excruciating amount of detail in the latter's papers[27].

That Boltzmann had indeed not abandoned his hopes of giving a mechanical interpretation of the Second Law is borne out by his work on Helmholtz's monocycles, first published in 1884, in his paper[28]: "On the Properties of Monocyclic and Other Related Systems", which allowed a formal analogy between appropriate changes of these simple mechanical systems characterized by a single frequency[29] and those appearing in the First and the Second Law for reversible thermodynamic changes. He begins this paper as follows[30]: "The most complete mechanical proof of the Second Law would clearly consist in showing that for each arbitrary mechanical process equations exist that are analogous to those of the Theory of Heat. Since, however, on the one hand the Law does not *seem* [my italics] to be correct in this generality and on the other hand, because of our ignorance of the nature of the *so-called* [my italics] atoms, the mechanical conditions under which the heat motion proceeds cannot be precisely specified, the problem arises to investigate in which cases and to what extent the equations of mechanics are analogous to those of the Theory of Heat". He continues: "One will not be concerned here with the construction of mechanical systems, which are completely identical with warm bodies, but rather with identifying all systems, that exhibit behavior more or less analogous to that of warm bodies". He further elaborates on this analogy in two more papers in the following years[31].

I quote the beginning of the third paper[31b] "New Proof of a Theorem Formulated by Helmholtz Concerning the Properties of Monocyclic Systems", to illustrate the importance Boltzmann attached to this work: "The great importance which the introduction of the notion of monocyclic systems and the development of their most important properties has for all investigations concerning the Second Law should make the following considerations appear as not completely superfluous...".

As an aside, I remark that Boltzmann's writings on the existence of atoms seem to be ambivalent and a mixture of, on the one hand, actually using atomism all through his works and elaborately discussing the many arguments in favor of it[32a], while, on the other hand, stating in writing the possibility of other equally valid descriptions of nature, as provided by the Energeticists or phenomenologists. Thus in his 1899 lecture mentioned above, he says[32b]: "From this follows that it cannot be our task to find an absolutely correct theory, but rather the simplest possible picture which represents experiment as best as possible. One could even think of the possibility of two entirely different theories, which are both equally simple and agree with the phenomena equally well, which therefore, although completely different, are both equally correct". Although true, I find it hard to escape the impression that this statement was meant more as an attempt to assuage his Energeticists opponents than as an account of his actual position. The difficulty, of course, was that at the time evidence for the existence of atoms was ultimately only circumstantial and that no direct experimental demonstration in any fashion had yet been given.

In the same 1884 paper mentioned above, Boltzmann introduces the notion of Ergoden[33]. It was used by Boltzmann as an equilibrium ensemble of systems (Gibbs' micro-canonical ensemble). According to the Ehrenfests[10], Boltzmann defines an ergodic system as one whose unperturbed motion goes, when indefinitely continued,

finally *"through each phase point"* that is consistent with its given total energy. In this way Boltzmann suggested how to understand on the basis of the dynamics of the gas molecules, i.e., from mechanics, that "ergodic (ensemble) averages"[34] in phase space could replace the time averages through which the macroscopic properties of the gas were defined. In their article, the Ehrenfests argued that Boltzmann's requirement for an ergodic system was too strong and they replaced it by introducing a quasi- ergodic system "which approaches each point of the energy surface arbitrarily close". The idea is that under such conditions the time and ensemble averages would still be the same. The classical ergodic theory culminated in Birkhoff's ergodic theorems[35] proving the existence of the time average and then for metrically transitive systems the equality of time and phase space averages. Later, it was the application of dynamical systems theory and the introduction of the concept of measure which allowed the more precise unification of mechanics and statistics that Boltzmann had in mind.

As in electromagnetic theory, so in the theory of gases, the mechanical aspects have been obliterated. In the theory of gases this occurred not only through Boltzmann's statistical method but mainly through Gibbs' 1902 book "Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics"[36]. It was also there that the term "Statistical Mechanics" was first introduced. Here, on purpose, all reference to the molecular "constitution of matter" was as much as possible avoided to achieve a generality similar to that of thermodynamics. The book was mainly devoted to a study of thermal equilibrium: the canonical ensemble, already introduced by Boltzmann[29] for a system in thermal equilibrium at a given temperature, as well as the micro-canonical ensemble were given their names and extensively studied. Their connection with thermodynamics was made via a thermodynamic analogy[37], as had been done earlier by Boltzmann[4c,15,28]. While thermodynamics never changed and was essentially unaffected by the advent of

quantum mechanics - except for the addition of the third law, which is not as absolute and general as the first two - Gibbs' ensembles had only to be modified slightly to accommodate quantum mechanics.

The Ehrenfests were rather critical of Gibbs' contributions to statistical mechanics and they gave a very subjective presentation of his accomplishments[38]. The main criticism was that Gibbs had only devoted essentially one chapter - and a purely descriptive at that - to the problem of the approach to equilibrium (ch.12), a problem that was central in the considerations of Boltzmann and the Ehrenfests. In this chapter Gibbs describes a generalization of Boltzmann's H-theorem in μ-space, the phase space of one molecule, to Γ-space, the phase space of the entire gas. This consideration, as well as the rest of the book, was entirely based on probability notions, and the whole basic molecular mechanism of collisions - viz. that of binary collisions for the dilute gas which Boltzmann had considered - was completely absent. I think the Ehrenfests' critical attitude in this has turned out to be unjustified since Gibbs' statistical mechanics has been far more influential than they surmised at the time. In fact, it has dominated the entire twentieth century and only now, with a renewed interest in nonequilibrium phenomena, is a revival of Boltzmann's mechanistic approach reemerging. Here one should keep in mind two things. First, even simple nonequilibrium phenomena are often far more difficult to treat than many rather complicated equilibrium phenomena. Second, starting with L. S. Ornstein's Ph.D. thesis "Application of the Statistical Mechanics of Gibbs to Molecular-Theoretical Questions" written under Lorentz's direction in 1908[39], the calculation of the thermodynamic properties of a gas in thermal equilibrium via the canonical and related distribution functions turned out to be far simpler than those based on the microcanonical ensemble. Gibbs' statistical mechanics has not only led to enormous advances in equi-

librium statistical mechanics but also, by virtue of, for instance, the introduction of the Renormalization Group in the theory of critical phenomena, to entirely new ways of thinking about what is relevant in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. And yet ...

3 Return of Mechanics - Boltzmann's Heritage

The revival of the role of mechanics in statistical mechanics is due to important new developments in mechanics itself or as it is now called the theory of dynamical systems, especially by the Russian school of mathematics, emanating from A. N. Kolmogorov and Ya. G. Sinai. This has lead in recent years to a beginning of a dynamical formulation of statistical mechanical problems, especially for nonequilibrium systems, near or far from equilibrium. Far from equilibrium means here a system with large gradients and therefore large deviations from Maxwell's (local) equilibrium velocity distribution function, where hydrodynamics cannot be applied, not a turbulent system, where a hydrodynamic description is still (believed to be) applicable. I will quote three examples.

1. Boltzmann's notion of ergodicity for Hamiltonian systems in equilibrium on the energy surface has, in a way, been generalized by Sinai, Ruelle and Bowen (SRB)[40] to dissipative systems in a nonequilibrium stationary state. In that case the attractor, corresponding to the nonequilibrium stationary state, plays the role of the energy surface in equilibrium and the SRB measure on the attractor in terms of expanding, i.e., positive Lyapunov exponents (which determine the rate of exponential separation of two initially very close trajectories) replaces the Liouville measure on the energy surface for systems in equilibrium. This allows the assignment of purely dynami-

cal weights to a macroscopic system even far from equilibrium, since the molecules, whose dynamical properties one uses, do not know how far the system is from equilibrium, as equilibrium is a macroscopic non-molecular concept, or, to paraphrase Maxwell[41]: "When one gets to the molecules the distinction between heat and work disappears, because both are [ultimately molecular] energy". This approach seems to differ in principle from the conventional ones, based on extending Gibbs' equilibrium ensembles to nonequilibrium, e.g. via a Chapman-Enskog-like solution of the Liouville equation for the entire system (instead of for the Boltzmann equation, for which it was originally designed). To be sure, these Gibbsian nonequilibrium ensembles also contain dynamics - no nonequilibrium description is possible without it - but not as unadulterated as in the SRB-measure. The farthest one has gone with these nonequilibrium Gibbs ensembles is the Kawasaki distribution function[42] and it is not excluded that there is an intimate connection between this distribution function and the SRB measure.

Recently the SRB measure has been checked for the first time far from equilibrium for a many (56) particle system by a computer experiment[43]. Here one studies very large temporary fluctuations of a shearing fluid in stationary states with very large shear rates. The ratio of the fluctuations of the stress tensor to have, during a finite time, a given value parallel or opposite to the applied shear stress, i.e. consistent with or "in violation of" the Second Law, respectively, was measured and found to be given correctly on the basis of the SRB measure. In fact, one has recently been able to indicate how this, in a way typical nonequilibrium statistical mechanical system, can perhaps be discussed on the basis of the SRB measure: at least a scenario has been formulated, where one could hope, at least in principle, to derive the just mentioned result rigorously from the SRB measure with "large N-dynamics"[44].

2. Relations between the transport coefficients and the Lyapunov exponents of a fluid in a nonequilibrium stationary state have been uncovered. While the former refer to hydrodynamic, i.e., nonequilibrium properties in ordinary three dimensional space, the latter refer to the dynamical behavior on the attractor in the multidimensional phase-space of the entire system. For the above mentioned many particle shearing fluid in a nonequilibrium stationary state, one has obtained an explicit expression for the viscosity coefficient of this fluid in terms of its two maximal - i.e., its largest and its smallest - Lyapunov exponents[45]. This expression gives a value for the viscosity which agrees numerically with that found directly from computer simulations for a 108 and 864 particle shearing fluid, not only in the linear (hydrodynamic) regime near equilibrium, where the viscosity is independent of the imposed shear rate, but even in the non-linear (rheological) regime, far from equilibrium, where the viscosity coefficient itself depends on the shear rate.

3. A somewhat analogous expression has been derived for the linear diffusion coefficient of a point particle in a regular triangular array of hard disks[46]. In addition, the diffusion coefficient[47,48*a*] as well as the pressure[48*b*] for this system have been computed using a cycle-expansion, i.e., an expansion in terms of the periods and Lyapunov exponents of the unstable periodic orbits of the particle in the hard disk system. Furthermore a number of rigorous results have been proved for the linear transport behavior of this system based on the SRB measure[49].

In all these cases the re-emergence of dynamics appears in a global Gibbsian-sense, in that it involves global Lyapunov exponents of the entire system, not detailed collision dynamics between small groups of particles as in kinetic theory.

It appears therefore that Boltzmann's attachment to mechanics, as exemplified by his unceasing attempts at a mechanical interpretation of the macroscopic behavior

of many particle systems, in particular of the Second Law of thermodynamics, has re-emerged after a hundred years, thanks to new developments in mechanics. I note that these new developments, apart from the above mentioned statistical mechanical problems, have so far been applied mainly to simple (one-dimensional) maps and few particle (i.e., few degrees of freedom) systems. For the connection with statistical mechanics it seems important to introduce methods into these dynamical considerations which use explicitly the very large number of degrees of freedom typical for statistical mechanical, i.e., for macroscopic systems. Such "large N-dynamics" could lead to a "statistical" dynamics that might be crucial to bridge the gap between the prevailing rigorous treatments of dynamical systems of a few degrees of freedom on the one hand and statistical mechanics on the other hand. For example, important distinctions in "small N-dynamics" as to the exact number of conservation laws (or of Axiom-A systems)[50] might be less relevant in the "large N-dynamics" for macroscopic systems.

A case in point would be to establish a connection between dynamical system theory and Boltzmann's kinetic theory of dilute gases. One could then ask: what is the connection between the linear viscosity of a dilute gas as given by the Boltzmann equation in terms of binary collision dynamics (e.g. as related to an eigenvalue of the linear Boltzmann collision operator[51]) and the above mentioned expression for the viscosity in terms of its two maximal Lyapunov exponents?

Before I end this mostly scientific presentation of Boltzmann's work in statistical mechanics and its heritage, I would like to remark that I have not just illustrated Boltzmann's work from a scientific but also from time to time from a human or psychological point of view. I believe that the latter aspects are too often missing in the discussion of scientists, especially those of the recent past. The "psychological" re-

marks are usually confined to anecdotes and occasional non-scientific comments. This is in contrast to what happens in the arts, where musicians, painters and especially writers are critically "psychoanalyzed" as to their behavior, their motivations and the connection between their personality and their work. In fact, this does exist to some degree for some scientists of the remote past, e.g. for Newton[52]. Of all nineteenth century scientists Boltzmann seems to be one of the most openly human and deeply tragic, i.e., an obvious candidate for such an endeavor. I hope that this often missing human dimension in the discussion of scientists and their work will be developed, although it is admittedly difficult to find writers who have both the scientific and the human perception and depth to do this[53].

I would like to conclude with two quotations, one about the work and one about the man. The first is from the obituary lecture by Lorentz, given one year after Boltzmann's death[54]. This quotation is perhaps even more applicable now than it was then and expresses beautifully Boltzmann's message for the future when Lorentz says: "The old of which Boltzmann speaks [see page 9 above] has in our days, thanks especially also to his own efforts, flowered to new, strong life, and even though its appearance has changed and will certainly often change in the course of time, we may yet hope that it will never get lost for science".

The other is from Boltzmann's 1899 lecture "On Recent Developments of the Methods of Theoretical Physics", mentioned before. It demonstrates that Boltzmann's deep love for science transcended all his suffering in practicing it. Here, after discussing the many achievements of atomism and the molecular theory of matter, which cannot at all be obtained by just using macroscopic equations alone without any further microscopic foundations - as is done in phenomenology or energetics - he asks[55]: "Will the old mechanics with the old forces ... in its essence remain, or live on

one day only in history ... superseded by entirely different notions? Will the essence of the present molecular theory, in spite of all amplifications and modifications, yet remain, or will one day an atomism totally different from the present prevail, or will even, in spite of my proof[56], the notion of an absolute continuum prove to be the best picture?" He concludes: "Indeed interesting questions! One almost regrets to have to die long before they are settled. O! immodest mortal! Your destiny is the joy of watching the ever-shifting battle!"[57].

Acknowledgement I have very much profited from various papers of M. J. Klein and from the books "The Kind of Motion We Call Heat" by S. G. Brush. I am also indebted to my colleagues G. Gallavotti, J. R. Dorfman, A. J. Kox, L. Spruch, A. Pais and especially M. J. Klein for helpful remarks. I thank my secretary, S. Rhyne for preparing the manuscript and her as well as my daughter, A. M. Cohen, for their help in translating Boltzmann's German and to the latter also for her help with the text.

References

1. L. Boltzmann: "Über die mechanische Bedentung des Zweiten Hauptsatzes der Wärmetheorie", Wien. Ber.53, 195-220 (1866); Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (W.A.), F. Hasenöhrl, ed., Chelsea Publ. Co., NY (1968) Band I, p.9-33.

2. L. Boltzmann: "Studien über das Gleichgewicht der lebendigen Kraft zwischen bewegten Materiellen Punkten", Wien. Ber.58, 517-560 (1868); W.A. Band I, p.49-96; id., "Lösung eines mechanisches Problems", Wien. Ber.58, 1035-1044 (1868); W. A. Band I, p.97.

3. See also, L. Boltzmann: "Über das Wärmegleichgewicht van Gasen auf welche äuszere Kräfte wirken", Wien. Ber.72, 427-457 (1875); W.A. Band II, p.1-30.

4. L. Boltzmann: (a) "Über das Wärmegleichgewicht zwischen mehratomigen Gasmolekulen", Wien. Ber.63, 397-418 (1871); W.A. Band I, p.237-258; (b) id., "Einige allgemeine Sätze über Wärmegleichgewicht", Wien. Ber.63, 679-711 (1871); W.A. Band I, p.259-287; (c) id., "Analytischer Beweis des zweiten Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie aus den Sätzen über das gleichgewicht der lebendigen Kraft", Wien. Ber.63, 712-732 (1871); W.A. Band I, p.288-308; (d) id., "Neuer Beweis zweier Sätze über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter mehratomigen Gasmolekülen", Wien. Ber. 95, 153-164 (1887); W.A. Band III, p.272-282.

5. Of Boltsmann's about 140 scientific papers around 18 deal with the Second Law and 16 deal with Maxwell's equilibrium distribution function or both.

6. L. Boltzmann: "Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen", Wien. Ber.66, 275-370 (1872); W.A. Band I, p.316-402.

7. See ref.6, W.A., Band I. p.345.

8. L. Boltzmann, "Bemerkungen über einige Probleme der mechanischen Wärmetheorie", Wien. Ber.74, 62-100 (1877), section II.

9. (a) L. Boltzmann: "Entgegnung auf die Wärmetheoretischen Betrachtungen des Hrn. E. Zermelo", Wied. Ann.57, 778-784 (1896); W.A. Band III, p.567-578; (b) id. "Zu Hrn. Zermelos Abhandling "Über die mechanische Erklärung irreversibler Vorgänge"", Wied. Ann.60, 392-398 (1897), W. A. Band III, p.579-586; (c) id. "Über einen mechanischen Satz Poincaré's", Wien. Ber. 106, 12-20 (1897); W. A. BAnd III, p.587-595.

10. (a) P. and T. Ehrenfest, "Begriffliche Grundlagen der statistischen Auffassung in der Mechanik",Enzycl. d. Mathem. Wiss. IV,2,II,Heft 6, p.3-90 (1912); p.30-32 or in P. Ehrenfest, *Collected Papers* (North-Holland, Amsterdam) p.213-309 (1959); p.240-242; (b) English translation by M. J. Moravcsik: P. and T. Ehrenfest, "The Conceptual Foundations of the Statistical Approach in Mechanics", Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY (1959), p.20-22.

11. The Energeticists wanted to explain all natural phenomena on the basis of energy alone, the most general "substance" present in the world.

12. "note well".

13. A. J. Kox: "H. A. Lorentz's Contributions to Kinetic Gas Theory", Ann. Sci. 47, 591-606 (1990);p.602.

14. A. J. Kox, l.c. p.598.

15. L. Boltzmann: "Über die Beziehung swischen dem zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung respektive den Sätzen über des Wärmegleichgewicht", Wien. Ber.76, 373-435(1877); W. A. Band II, p.164-223.

16. Ref. 15,p.164.

17. Cf. A. Einstein, "Autobiographical Notes" in: *"Albert Einstein: Philosopher - Scientist"*, P. A. Schilp, ed., The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. VII, Evanston,

IL, (1949) p.47-49. See also: B. Hoffman, *"Albert Einstein, Creator and Rebel"*, New Amer. Libr., NY (1972) p.58,59.

18. See, e.g., E. G. D. Cohen: "Fifty Years of Kinetic Theory", Physica A 194, 229-257 (1993).

19. L. Boltzmann, "Vorlesungen über Gastheorie", 2 vols (Barth, Leizig, 1896, 1898); engl. transl. by S. G. Brush as "Lectures on Gas Theory", Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkeley (1964).

20. L. Boltzmann, "Vorlesunger über Maxwell's Elektrizitätstheorie" (Aus den Mitteilungen des naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins in Graz. August 1873.) in: "Populäre Schriften",second ed., Barth, Leizig (1919) p.11-24.

21. J. C. Maxwell, "On Faraday's Lines of Force", Trans. Cambr. Phil. Soc. 10, 27-83 (1856); Scientific Papers 1, Cambridge, U. K., p.155.

22. L. Boltzmann: "Über die Entwicklung der Methoden der theoretischen Physik in neuerer Zeit", in: *"Populäre Schriften"*, second ed., Barth, Leipzig (1919) p.198-227.

23. Ref. 22,p.204,205.

24. Ref. 4b, p. 259-260.

25. J. C. Maxwell, "On Boltzmann's theorem on the average distribution of energy in a system of material points", Cambr. Phil. Soc. Trans. 12, 547-575 (1879); Scientific Papers 2, Cambridge, U. K., p.713-741 (1890). See also ref. 28, p.123.

26. Ref. 25, p.715.

27. See, e.g. M.J. Klein, "The Maxwell-Boltzmann Relationship", in: A.I.P. Conference Proceedings, *"Transport Phenomena"*, J. Kestin, ed., Amer. Inst. Phys., New York (1973) p.300-307.

28. L. Boltzmann: "Über die Eigenschaften monozyklischen und andere damit verwandter Systeme", Zeitschr.f. R.u.Angew. Math (Crelles Journal) 98, 68-94(1884);

W. A. Band III,p.122 - 152.

29. Ref. 28,p.123,footnote 1.

30. Ref. 28, p.122. This was pointed out to me by G. Gallavotti, cf. G. Gallavotti, "Ergodicity, Ensembles and Irreversibility", J. Stat. Phys. 78, 1571-1589 (1995).

31. (a) L. Boltzmann: "Über einige Fälle, wo die lebendige Kraft nicht integrierender Nenner des Differentials der zugeführten Energie ist", Wien. Ber. 92, 853-875 (1885); W.A. Band III, p.153-175; (b) id., "Neuer Beweis eines von Helmholtz aufgestellten Theorems betreffende die Eigenschaften monozyclischen Systeme", Gött. Nachr. (1886) 209-213; W.A. Band III, p.176-181.

32. (a) See e.g., L. Boltzmann, "Über die Unentbehrlichkeit der Atomistik in der Naturwissenschaften" in *Populäre Schriften*, second ed., Barth, Leipzig (1919) p. 141-157; (b) ref.22,p.216.

33. See ref. 28,p.134.

34. See ref. 10(a) p.30,footnote 83; ref.10(b) p.89,note 88.

35. G. D. Birkhoff, (a) "Proof of the Ergodic Theorem", Proc. Nat. Acad. USA 17, 656-660 (1931); (b) id., "Probability and Physical Systems", Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 361-379 (1932); (c) G. D. Birkhoff and B. 0. Koopman, "Recent Contributions to the Ergodic Theory", Proc. Nat. Acad. USA 18, 279-287 (1932) and (d) G. D. Birkhoff and P. A. Smith, "Structure Analysis of Surface Transformations", J. Math. Pures Appl. 7, 345-379 (1928). See also: A. I. Khinchin: *Mathematical Foundations of Statistical Mechanics*, Dover, New York, Ch. II, p.19-32; E. Hopf, *Ergodentheoric*, Chelsea Publ. Cy., New York (1948).

36. J. W. Gibbs, *Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics*, Yale University Press (1902); also Dover Publications, NY, (1960).

37. Ref 36, p.42-45.

38. Ref 10 (a) p.53-70; (b) p.44-63.

39. L. S. Ornstein: "Toepassing der Statistische Mechanica van Gibbs op Molekulair-Theoretische Vraagstukken", Leiden (1908).

40. See e.g. J. P. Eckmann and D. Ruelle, "Ergodic Theory of Chaos and Strange Attractors", Rev. Mod. Phys. 57 617-656 (1985), p.639.

41. J. C. Maxwell: "Tait's Thermodynamics", Nature 17, 257-259 (1878); The Scientific Papers of James Clerk Maxwell, Dover Publ., NY (1952), Vol.2, p.660-671; see p.669.

42. D. J. Evans and G. P. Morriss, *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibrium Liquids*, Academic Press, New York (1990) p.171.

43. D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen and G. P. Morriss, "Probability of Second Law Violations in Shearing Steady States", Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 2401-2404 (1993); id. 71, 3616 (1993).

44. G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, "Dynamical Ensembles in Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics", Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2694-2697 (1995); ibid., "Dynamical Ensembles in Stationary States", J. Stat. Phys. 80, 931-970 (1995).

45. D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen and G. P. Morriss, "Viscosity of a simple fluid from its maximal Lyapunov exponents", Phys. Rev. A42, 5990-5997 (1990); See also: H. A. Posch and W. G. Hoover, "Lyapunov Instability of Dense Lennard-Jones Fluids", Phys. Rev. A38, 473-482 (1988); id., "Equilibrium and Nonequilibrium Lyapunov Spectra for Dense Fluids and Solids", Phys. Rev. A 39, 2175-2188 (1989).

46. P. Gaspard and G. Nicolis, "Transport Properties, Lyapunov Exponents and Entropy Per Unit Time", Phys. Rev. Lett.65, 1693-1696 (1990).

47. (a) P. Cvitanovič, P. Gaspard and T. Schreiber, "Investigation of the Lorentz Gas in Terms of Periodic Orbits", Chaos 2, 85-90 (1992); (b) W. W. Vance, "Unstable

Periodic Orbits and Transport Properties of Nonequilibrium Steady States", Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1356-1359 (1992).

48. (a) G. Morriss and L. Rondoni, "Periodic Orbit Expansions for the Lorentz Gas", J. Stat. Phys.75, 553-584 (1994); (b) G. P. Morriss, L. Rondini and E. G. D. Cohen, "A Dynamical Partition Function for the Lorentz Gas", J. Stat. Phys. (1994).

49. N. J. Chernov, G. L. Eyink, J. L. Lebowitz and Ya. G. Sinai, "Derivation of Ohm's Law in a Deterministic Mechanical Model", Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 2209-2212 (1993); id. "Steady State Electrical Conduction in the Periodic Lorentz Gas", Comm. Math. Phys. 154, 569-601 (1993).

50. Ref.40, p.636.

51. 1 am indebted for this suggestion to Prof. B. Knight of The Rockefeller University.

52. See, e.g., F. E. Manuel, *A Portrait of Isaac Newton*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA (1968).

53. Exceptions are, e.g., M. J. Klein, *"Paul Ehrenfest"*, Vol. I, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1970); C. W. F. Everitt, "Maxwell's Scientific Creativity," in: *"Springs of Scientific Creativity"*, R. Aris, H. T. Davis, R. H. Stuewer, eds., Univ. Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN (1983) Ch. 4, p.71-141; M. Dresden, *"H. A. Kramers: Between Tradition and Revolution"*, Springer Verlag (1987) and W. Moore, *"Schrödinger"*, Cambrige University Press (1989).

54. H. A. Lorentz, "Ludwig Boltzmann", Commemoration oration at the meeting of the German Physical Society, 17 May 1907; Verhandl. Deutsch. Physik. Gesells. 12, 206-238 (1907); Collected Works, Vol. IX, p.359-390; p.389.

55. Ref.22, p.226,227.

56. See e.g. L. Boltzmann, "Statistische Mechanik" in ref. 22, p.358.

57. Ref.22, p.227: “O unbescheidener Sterbliche! Dein Los ist die Freude am Anblicke des wogenden Kampfes!”.